

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-21 and 23-30 remain pending in the instant application. All claims presently stand rejected. Claims 1, 12, 13, 15, and 23 are amended herein. Claim 31 is newly presented. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17-19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Reasor et al. (US 2004/0083196 A1).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element of the claim is found in a single reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.” M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

Amended independent claim 15 now recites, in pertinent part,

generating a browser page to display hardware configuration settings of hardware entities of a computing device **during a pre-boot runtime of the computing device** using a browser, the hardware configuration settings based at least in part on data structures provided by the hardware entities; and changing at least one of the hardware configuration settings **during the pre-boot runtime of the computing device** in response to input received via the browser.

Applicants respectfully submit that Reasor fails to disclose displaying hardware configuration settings of a computing device within a browser during a pre-boot runtime of the computing device. Furthermore, Reasor fails to disclose changing hardware configuration settings of a computing device in response to input received via a browser during a pre-boot runtime of the computing device.

To be sure, Reasor discloses,

When a computer is turned on, it typically requires basic software programs that can be **accessed immediately upon powering-on**. Firmware generally serves the computing system in such a way. System firmware is generally comprised of the most basic programs in the computer system, and it is usually the platform upon which the operating system is supported. It is typically stored in ROM in an address **accessible by a CPU upon power-up**. One of its many duties is to initialize the computer by starting the operating system and

configuring the system hardware. Hardware can be any physical part of the computing system and includes, among other things, the CPU, memory, and any peripheral devices that may be externally connected. **Configuration is accomplished when the system firmware identifies connected hardware and queries the hardware to determine the hardware properties.** Once this information is found, the properties are then reported back to the system, thereby establishing what hardware is connected to the system. **The computing system generally arranges this information along with information from other hardware into a database.** Once the hardware is described in the database, it is usually ready to be used by the system. After initialization is completed, the system firmware is generally used as an interface between the computing system's hardware, such as its processors, and its operating system so that the operating system need not control the system hardware directly, but rather the operating system communicates to the firmware, which, in turn, controls the system hardware.

Reasor, paragraph [0012]. Accordingly, this portion of *Reasor* discloses that connected hardware is identified, hardware properties determined, and the collected information arranged into a database during a pre-boot runtime of the computer. However, this portion fails to disclose displaying hardware configuration settings of the computer within a browser during a pre-boot runtime, nor does it disclose changing hardware configuration settings of the computer in response to input received via a browser during a pre-boot runtime.

Reasor further discloses,

In another embodiment, XML representations may be utilized to allow users to access information about the hardware in their complex computing systems without having to obtain custom or proprietary programs. **Because XML is a standard language, the embodiments described herein may preferably be adapted to serve hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) directly from the firmware to a browser or other such display interface to display the system hardware properties.** In yet another embodiment, the creator of the device tree may also create style sheets, such that he may control the view of the device tree as it would appear to a person using a browser or similar display interface to display hardware properties. Style sheets describe the display of documents in XML.

Reasor, paragraph [0024]. The above passage of *Reasor* is the only portion of *Reasor* that mentions or discusses displaying system hardware properties to a browser. However, this portion of *Reasor* fails to disclose displaying the system hardware properties to a browser **during a pre-boot runtime** of a computing system. In fact, the

last sentence of paragraph [0012] recited above, discloses that the firmware is used as an interface between the computing system's hardware, such as its processors, and its **operating system**. If the firmware discloses in Reasor is acting as an interface with an operating system, then by definition the actions discussed in Reasor are occurring during the operating system runtime—not a pre-boot runtime. In any event, paragraph [0024] of Reasor fails to specifically or inherently disclose displaying the system hardware properties during a pre-boot runtime. M.P.E.P. § 2131 requires that “the identical invention must be shown in as **complete detail** as is contained in the claim,” which is not the case here.

Consequently, Reasor fails to disclose each and every element of claim 15, as required under M.P.E.P. § 2131. Independent claims 1 and 12 include similar novel elements as independent claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants request that the instant §102 rejections of claims 1, 12 and 15 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 7, 8, 11, 14, 16, 20, 22, and 23-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reasor in view of Mahmoud et al. (US 7,007,158).

“To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Amended independent claim 23 now recites, in pertinent part,

the translator to monitor a port of the computing device and to convert data structures corresponding to the multiple hardware entities into a markup language to generate a browser page to display hardware configuration settings of the multiple hardware entities in a browser in response to a requested received on the port.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Reasor and Mahmoud fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a translator that monitors a port of a computing device and generates a browser page to display hardware configuration settings in response to a request received on the port.

Consequently, the combination of Reasor and Mahmoud fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 23, as required under M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Accordingly, Applicants request that the instant §103(a) rejections of claim 23 be withdrawn.

The dependent claims are novel and nonobvious over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with their respective independent claims, in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the instant § 103 and § 102 rejections of the dependent claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the applicable rejections have been overcome and all claims remaining in the application are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at (206) 292-8600 if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.


CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Please credit any overpayment to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: Jan. 18, 2007



Cory G. Claassen

Reg. No. 50,296

Phone: (206) 292-8600